Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the personal interview conducted on January 13, 2005.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for returning the signed and initialed copies of the Information Disclosure Statements (PTO 1449) filed July 15, 2002, and August 5, 2004, that were included with the Office Action.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, and not as an attempt to overcome the pending rejections, claims 1, 6, 10, 11, and 16 are currently amended. No claims are cancelled or newly added. No new subject matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, allowance of all the rejected claims is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In light of the amendment to claim 10 to correct a claim dependency error, this rejection is rendered moot.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Shanahan et al. (EP 1143356, 2001). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, determining, from the plurality of object repository types, the one or more object repository types that store at least one object, wherein the object comprises metadata. Independent claims 6, 11, and 16 include similar recitations, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a work request may be processed by determining a repository type from which information content is gathered (see the specification at page 10, lines 13 and 14). The repository type may include one of a plurality of possible types, such as, for

example, Lotus Notes, Lotus QuickPlace, Domino.doc, electronic mail, Web and file system, *etc.* (see the specification at page 4, lines 22 and 23).

Shanahan appears to disclose a system for processing a meta-document that has a set of document service requests associated therewith (see Shanahan at paragraph 9). In the system disclosed by Shanahan, a *meta-document* may be viewed as an active repository for information (see Shanahan at paragraphs 3 and 8). Shanahan appears to only disclose the system for use with a meta-document as the only type of repository. Therefore, Shanahan does not disclose a plurality of object repository types and determining, from the plurality of object repository types, the one or more object repository types that store at least one object, wherein the object comprises metadata. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 based on Shanahan must be withdrawn at least because Shanahan does not disclose all of the features of the claimed invention.

Similarly, the rejections of independent claims 6, 11, and 16 must be withdrawn. Further, claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-15, and 17-19 depend from corresponding ones of claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shanahan in further view of Summerlin et al. (USP 6,553,365, 2003). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

With respect to claims 5, 10, and 20, the Examiner admits that Shanahan is deficient at least for failing to disclose a processor that comprises at least one of a full-text engine, a metrics engine, and a taxonomy engine. The Examiner alleges that Summerlin discloses this feature and attempts to cure the admitted deficiency of Shanahan through combination with Summerlin. Summerlin is apparently drawn to a system for automatically classifying electronic documents that are candidates to become an official record (see Summerlin at the Abstract). However, even if the Examiner's allegation regarding the disclosure of Summerlin is accurate, the combination of Shanahan and Summerlin does not teach or suggest determining, from the plurality of object repository types, the one or more object repository types that store at least one

object, wherein the object comprises metadata.   Since claims 5, 10, and 20 depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 16, respectively, these claims are allowable at least by virtue of dependency, as well as for the features that they add.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: March 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia   22102
703-905-2000

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION IN AN APPLICATION

Form PTO-1449

Docket Number	Application Number
042846-0313082	10/044,913

Applicant(s)
James Patrick GOODWIN *et al.*

Filing Date	Group Art Unit
January 15, 2002	2178

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL	REF	DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	A	6,349,295	02/19/2002	Tedesco *et al.*	707	3	
	B	6,377,949	04/23/2002	Gilmour	707	10	
	C	2002/0087600	07/04/2002	Newbold	707	514	
	D	6,560,588	05/06/2003	Minter	706	50	
	E	6,640,229	10/28/2003	Gilmour *et al.*	707	9	

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

	REF	DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	Translations YES	NO

OTHER DOCUMENTS *(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)*

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED

EXAMINER: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP Section 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to Applicant.